DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 913 HE 025 749

TITLE	The California State University Faculty Recruitment Workshop (Los Angeles, CA, April 24-25, 1989). Report.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Long Beach. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Jun 89
NOTE	30p.; This document is part of a collection produced under the auspices of the California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL, created in 1988, facilitates a 20-campus systemwide network of faculty affiliates in response to the demand for improved teaching and learning in the college classroom.
AVAILABLE FROM	California State University Academic Publications Program, CSU Chancellor's Office, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 132, Long Beach, CA 90802 ($6).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; Employment Interviews; *Faculty Recruitment; Guides; Higher Education; *Personnel Selection; Program Development; Search Committees (Personnel); State Universities; Teacher Orientation; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Selection; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	California State University; *California State University Inst for Teach Learn; *College Teaching and Learning Collection

ABSTRACT

This report presents issues and highlights from a California State University (CSU) workshop that had the following goals: (1) to present effective recruitment strategies and programs, including those for minorities, women, and the disabled, which have been employed on a CSU campus and which could be of benefit to others; and (2) to model faculty recruitment workshops which could be adapted for use on campuses. Topics covered in the workshop presentations included affirmative action in recruiting, generating a pool of faculty candidates, methods and approaches for recruiting in the national market, the role of the university administration, inter-institutional recruitment strategies, selling the campus to the candidate, and orienting the new faculty member to the school. Ideas on producing a campus handbook about faculty recruitment are also provided, as well as a sample of a campus interview schedule. Suggestions for sponsoring similar workshops are provided, and a list is offered of several controversial recruiting issues and questions. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 216 913

A Report on The California State University Faculty Recruitment Workshop

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
California State
University
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Faculty and Staff Relations
Office of the Chancellor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
and
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

The California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning (CSU/ITL) facilitates a 20-campus network of teaching and learning programs in the CSU system. ERIC/HE has entered into an agreement with CSU/ITL to process documents produced by the system and create a mini-collection within the ERIC database.

Major objectives of this initiative are as follows:

- increase awareness of the work of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning;
- increase access to the work of CSU/ITL affiliates;
- begin to build a subset of information on teaching and learning that supports *The National Teaching and Learning Forum (NTLF)*, ERIC/HE's newsletter;
- encourage use of the ERIC system by CSU/ITL member affiliates and the *NTLF* readership; and
- test a model for collaboration between ERIC/HE and a major higher education system.

All CSU/ITL ERIC RIE citations are tagged with the following identifiers appearing in the IDEN:Field:

- College Teaching and Learning Collection; and
- California State University for Teaching and Learning.

All CSU/ITL citations carry the following statement in the Note Field:

> This document is part of a collection produced under the auspices of the California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL, created in 1988, facilitates a 20-campus systemwide network of faculty affiliates in response to the demand for improved teaching and learning in the college classroom.

A Report

on

The California State University Faculty Recruitment Workshop

Los Angeles - April 24-25, 1989

Prepared by the Faculty Affairs Section
Faculty and Staff Relations

Office of the Chancellor
June 1989

REPORT ON THE CSU FACULTY RECRUITMENT WORKSHOP
Los Angeles - April 24-25, 1989

Introduction

On April 24-25, 1989, the Faculty Affairs section of Faculty and Staff Relations in the Chancellor's Office sponsored a workshop on faculty recruitment. The subject has become a growing concern within the CSU, and several campuses have expressed an interest in systemwide assistance. Concern was heightened by the release in July 1988 of the CSU task force report, **The Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty**.

The report makes twenty-four recommendations which are directed to the Presidents and to the Chancellor. Many will require new appropriations to the CSU budget before they can be implemented. However, others are being addressed within current funding levels. In Recommendation #4 the report asked "that the Presidents, with the assistance of the Chancellor, undertake the responsibility to provide assistance, information, training and coordination of support mechanisms to departments as they seek to hire new faculty." Recommendation #8 called upon the Chancellor and Presidents to "encourage and assist cooperation among campuses in recruiting faculty." The Faculty Recruitment Workshop was an affordable response to both of these Task Force recommendations.

The invited audience included academic administrators who are responsible for faculty recruitment and senior faculty who are in a position to serve their campuses as resources for faculty recruitment. The objective of the workshop was two-fold:

1. To present effective recruitment strategies and programs, including those for minorities, women and the disabled, which have been employed on a CSU campus and which could be of benefit to others.

2. To model faculty recruitment workshops which could be adapted for use on campuses.

Each CSU campus was invited to send two participants to the workshop. Although overall demand exceeded the original expectations of the sponsors, a few campuses were unable to send two persons. Regrets were also received from other persons whose schedules conflicted with the dates of the workshop. Several among the latter requested that Faculty Affairs produce a record of the workshop which could serve as a recruitment resource for the campuses.

This report is an effort to meet such requests. It is not a transcription of workshop proceedings. Rather, it is a summary of those workshop issues and highlights which we hope will be of use to faculty recruiters. Experienced recruiters will find some ideas that are familiar and some, we hope, which provide new, specific, concrete approaches to faculty recruitment.

We wish to thank the many workshop participants who served as volunteer session reporters. They provided much of the raw material upon which this report is based. We are grateful to Don Cameron, CSU, Northridge and Arthurlene Towner, CSU, Hayward for serving as critical commentators in the wrapup session. Special thanks are due the presenters from the campuses who were cited in workshop evaluations for their excellent preparations and presentations. Some of them were reluctant to claim or admit to expertise as faculty recruiters. However, it was their ability to convey their direct experiences, and to reflect upon them, that provided the heart of the workshop.

The recruitment of new faculty is a joint effort; the Board of Trustees establishes overall policy, the campus administration authorizes positions to be filled and department faculty search for and recommend a final candidate. The President makes the appointment. It is the goal of all to hire and retain the highest quality faculty available. The Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty, July 1988.

"This is not a real estate seminar, though we recognize how serious that problem is." Judith Hunt, State University Dean, Faculty Affairs.

Not an Albatross but a Lodestone: Affirmative Action as a Recruiting Tool

Presenters: **Charon D'Aiello**, Director, Affirmative Action Program, CSU, Los Angeles.
Alfredo Gonzales, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CSU, Los Angeles.
Tim Dong, Acting Assistant Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, Office of the Chancellor

At CSU, Los Angeles affirmative action in faculty recruiting has become a way of life. The concern for affirmative action is not limited to the need to comply with federal, state and systemwide codes and regulations. It is the ethnic diversity of the student body that requires faculty diversity and which makes affirmative action hiring a priority. Long-term institutional effectiveness is inseparable from and dependent upon successful affirmative action hiring. Out of this critical need, a comprehensive program has been developed to transform affirmative action into a powerful tool for attracting and hiring the future faculty.

The working principle of the CSU, Los Angeles program is that real affirmative action should be moved out of the Affirmative Action Office into those offices which are most directly responsible for the recruitment and hiring of faculty. These are chiefly the offices of the school deans to whom the director of affirmative action programs gives direct support. The deans bear this responsibility because of their unique position. They authorize the allocation of positions. They meet with departmental hiring committees and provide operating instructions. They monitor a school's recruitment and selection activities. Deans also have the ability to make quick opportunity moves which promote affirmative action goals without getting bogged down in compliance procedures.

After two years of discussion, this principle was formalized in 1987 at CSU, Los Angeles by a working agreement among the deans and the vice president for academic affairs. The agreement specifies areas of responsibility for each party. It establishes an active process for recruiting and hiring promising ethnic minority candidates, even when specific vacancies have not been identified and in cases in which a candidate has not completed a doctoral program. Release time and other support is offered to new minority faculty to maximize their opportunity to meet retention, tenure and promotion requirements.

A highly experimental feature of the working agreement has been establishment of minority recruiting teams. The teams have functioned for the past two years under the supervision of the vice president for academic affairs. Funding comes from an off-the-top allocation of 20% of institutional faculty recruiting dollars. In their first year of travel (early fall of 1987), expenses for two teams were $10,000. In the subsequent year the cost was only $7,500 (experience led to greater efficiency). Each team has consisted of a senior faculty member and an academic administrator, one a Black and the other a Chicano. In cooperation with deans and departments, team members have

prepared themselves with useful facts, itineraries, appointments, the names of contacts, and suitcases of brochures, catalogs and recruiting materials.

The objective of the teams has been to visit research universities in the New York/Philadelphia area and in the American Southwest where there are significant numbers of Black and Chicano doctoral students. Though many universities were willing to accommodate a recruiting team, there was no way to predict the response by graduate students on host campuses.

Experience shows that the response has exceeded the most optimistic prediction. Hundreds of minority doctoral students have attended scheduled meetings. Forty-five students at the University of Texas, Austin waited more than an hour when team members were unavoidably late. The average meeting was attended by about 30 students. Many attendees reported that they had never been contacted by a prospective university employer, and they expressed delight that CSU, Los Angeles is interested in them. Faculty even came to get information for their students. In the second year of the program, more than 400 minority doctoral students were identified and referred to appropriate departments at CSU, Los Angeles as potential faculty candidates.

Close collaboration between the minority recruiting teams and department chairs has been the key to the success of this program. There have been several meetings with department chairs to brainstorm on follow-up strategies. A number of chairs have written encouraging and informative letters to doctoral students who were identified by a recruiting team. Most have invited the students to visit their departments whenever they find themselves in the Los Angeles area.

It is believed that the minority recruiting teams have uncovered a rich lode of future faculty for a campus which places high priority on cultural and ethnic diversity. The preliminary results are promising. The method is obviously applicable elsewhere, and it should be a valuable means for general faculty recruitment in disciplines where the need is great and the national pool of candidates is limited.

Tips for a Recruiting Team

1. Target institutions carefully and visit them early in the academic year. Position announcements must be ready before team leaves.

2. Don't make arrangements for a visit through the placement office of a host campus; contact the Graduate Dean or Vice President.

3. Don't load yourself down with multiple copies of your campus catalogue. These are not in great demand.

4. Do be prepared to answer questions about workload, tenure requirements, salary, support for professional activity.

5. Learn about the strengths of your departments and their faculty. These facts are appreciated by prospective candidates.

6. Be prepared for questions about earthquakes, freeway murders and other non-academic matters.

7. Collaborate closely with academic departments before and after your trip.

The Faculty Supply Picture: Generating Your Own Pool of Candidates

Presenters: **Vivian Vidoli, Dean**, Division of Graduate Studies and Research, CSU, Fresno
Judith Hunt, State University Dean, Faculty Affairs, Office of the Chancellor

CSU, Fresno has launched a program to introduce undergraduates to successful graduate students which has incidentally served as an effective means for developing a pool of potential new faculty. **The Visiting Scholars Program invites outstanding young minority and women scholars to visit the Fresno campus for two days at a modest cost.** Modelled on the recruiting methods of a baseball coach, these visits expose undergraduate students at Fresno to the work of outstanding graduate students in Ph.D. programs in the hope that more of the former, especially women and minorities, will be inspired to pursue graduate studies. This could increase graduate enrollment at Fresno, and, in the long run, it would enlarge the pool of potential faculty. A fortuitous by-product of the program is that some of the visiting scholars have developed an interest in CSU, Fresno as an employer. Two of fourteen visitors to date have joined the faculty.

The mechanics of the Visiting Scholars Program are important to its success. The graduate dean has worked through the network of her counterparts at doctoral institutions. They have been asked to nominate outstanding doctoral candidates and post-doctoral fellows who would be good prospects as visiting scholars. Resumes of nominees are received and referred to Fresno's school deans. Invitations to scholars are extended by departments which are interested in hosting a particular scholar.

Over a two-day schedule, the visiting scholar gives three presentations:

1. A research presentation to faculty and students in the scholar's discipline.

2. A lecture to a general audience of undergraduate students and community members (with special invitations to community college faculty and other interested groups).

3. A 2-3 hour open session with students.

The costs of the Visiting Scholars Program have been comparatively low. Each scholar is paid a token stipend of $75 to $100 (the higher amount for post-doctoral fellows) plus state-rate reimbursement for the expenses. Host departments are allocated $200 for support costs. Visits by in-state scholars have averaged about $600, and those by out-of-state scholars have averaged $1000.

While the Visiting Scholars Program has targeted women and minority scholars, and has served a very useful affirmative action purpose, it is a

model which could easily be employed as a general recruiting strategy for both graduate students and new faculty in any discipline in low supply. Another of the incidental happy outcomes of the program is that CSU, Fresno has established an especially close relationship with the Graduate School of Stanford University, an obvious continuing source of qualified faculty candidates.

Multiple Effects of the Visiting Scholars Program

1. Undergraduate students receive stimulating co-curricular academic experiences.

2. Minority and female undergraduates benefit from modeling by outstanding minority and female doctoral students. Undergraduates are encouraged to pursue graduate study.

3. Relationships with doctoral institutions develop or improve.

4. Potential candidates for faculty positions are introduced to the campus and may be hired as tenure-track faculty.

5. Demonstration of the positive aspects of affirmative action takes place, both in an administrator's active involvement and in the exposure of the high quality of the visiting scholars.

6. The campus engages in successful public relations with the community.

Other Ideas for Generating Your Own Pool

1. Telephone departments at targeted universities and request the names of their doctoral candidates and recent Ph.D. recipients, particularly those who are minorities, disabled or women. Then follow up with personal letters.

2. Make use of the CSU Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program with students identified as above or prospective students.

3. Seek the names of students in various fellowship programs such as the Danforth Fellowships.

4. Get involved in the California Pre-Doctoral Program, starting next year, designed to encourage the entry of promising undergraduates into doctoral programs.

What Successful Hiring Committees Have Learned About Recruiting in the National Market

Presenters: **Joseph Magaddino**, Chair, Department of Economics, CSU, Long Beach
Dan Vencill, Professor of Economics, San Francisco State University

The economics departments at CSU, Long Beach and San Francisco State University have conducted a number of successful faculty searches in recent years. Each has also experienced failed searches. Although economics is not a Designated Market Discipline, it is a relatively "hard-to-hire" field because of the employment alternatives available to economists. The competitive nature of faculty recruitment in the national market has provided a learning experience for these departments which is worth sharing with departments in other disciplines which will soon face similar challenges.

CSU, Long Beach has conducted fourteen tenure-track searches for economists in recent years. Eight faculty have been hired, one of whom has since resigned. Of these new faculty, three are women, two are Asians and one is Hispanic. The Economics Department at SFSU has hired three tenure-track faculty in the past two years, one a female and another an Asian male. The faculty responsible for recruiting and hiring in both departments recommend several common methods and approaches:

1. Early commitment from the University for a tenure track position is essential, preferably in the spring of the year prior to the search.

2. Recruitment must be carefully planned, undertaken at the beginning of the academic year, and carried out with scrupulous attention to detail in close cooperation with the school dean.

3. Successful recruitment is expensive, but the cost of a hiring mistake is much greater. Poor choices in tenure-track positions "steal our future" and are costly to terminate, both in time and in money.

4. Quality and diversity of the faculty must be priority concerns. The position allocation should remain with the department until successfully filled, in another recruiting cycle, if necessary.

As an integral feature of recruiting strategy, both departments interview candidates at the annual meeting of the American Economics Association in late December. Interviews at the national meeting are by prior appointment only, with candidates whose resumes and letters of application have been carefully reviewed by the department hiring committee and who are, in effect, semi-finalists. Three or more finalists are interviewed later on campus.

Tips on Interviewing at Professional Society Meetings

1. Limit appointments to the most promising applicants (Long Beach interviews about 18; San Francisco 20-30).

2. Use a "quality environment," e.g. a hotel suite as opposed to a cramped room or a corner of the hotel lobby.

3. Be well prepared for each candidate. Don't take notes or shuffle resumes during an interview.

4. Have ample supplies of informative materials on hand (campus bulletin, information on graduate program, faculty, teaching load, plus selling points). You are marketing yourselves and your department.

5. Plan to discuss those things which might serve as a barrier to a candidate accepting an offer, e.g., the high cost of living in your area. Better now than risk a rejection after the candidate has flown out for an interview.

6. Allow 5-10 minutes between interviews for writing notes and allow time for discussing candidates at the end of each day.

"You want to be the #1 choice of your #1 choice." Joe Magaddino, CSU, Long Beach.

"Consider candidate, spouse and family as a decision-making entity." Dan Vencill, SFSU.

What the University Administration Can Do for Departments

Presenters: **Lance Masters**, Chair, Department of Marketing, CSU, San Bernardino
David Porter, Dean, School of Business and Public Administration, CSU, San Bernardino

Rapid expansion at CSU, San Bernardino has placed some academic departments under intensive faculty recruitment pressure. In the last four years nearly sixty tenure-track faculty have been hired. The pressure has been greatest within the School of Business and Public Administration, which enrolls more students than any other unit. In the face of stiff national competition and the exacting standards of AACSB, The School has hired 36 new faculty in four years. Success has been possible only through careful planning and close cooperation between the campus and school administration and the departments.

Several types of administrative support to departments have been shown to be especially effective. These are indicated by the following recommendations:

1. Encourage departments to define their position needs as early as possible. Through strategic planning, openings should be identified at least two years in advance.

2. Give departments early authorization to recruit new faculty so that advertising can begin in mid-summer and offers can be made by Thanksgiving. For the School of Business and Public Administration, placement of a large ad in the Chronicle of Higher Education in July has generated many applications.

3. Allow departments to hire high quality candidates "off-line" rather than at the standard step of the assistant professor rank. Combine five positions into three or four positions in order to attract and keep faculty.

4. Expedite the hiring process and hire early.

5. Support attendance by faculty at national meetings where networking and direct recruiting may be undertaken.

6. Encourage continuing relationships with doctoral universities. Support offers of visiting professorships to their senior faculty. Send them graduate students.

7. Provide training and backup to the departments to improve their recruiting and hiring techniques. Get them organized.

8. Develop useful and positive materials. "Sell the sizzle and not the steak." Emphasize the assets of the campus without distorting the truth.

9. Use non-state funds to help pay for recruitment.

10. Offer help in locating suitable employment for a candidate's spouse.

11. Support the socialization of new faculty. See that each receives a personal letter from the President. Provide a useful handbook to new faculty.

"The dean's job is to preach the successful search gospel to department and faculty at all levels... The dean should be a fully active partner in the department's tenure-track recruitment process." Dan Vencill, SFSU

Inter-Institutional Recruitment Strategies

Presenter: **Gale K. Larsen**, Chair, Department of English, CSU, Northridge and Chair, CSU English Council

The very great expense of recruiting for faculty in the national market has led to some consideration within the CSU of inter-institutional cooperation. An excellent example of a cooperative strategy has been provided by the CSU English Council, composed of the chairs of English departments at CSU campuses.

The English Council has placed faculty recruitment on its agenda for several years. During the past two years the Council has sponsored a wine and cheese reception for all candidates who were scheduled for interviews by a CSU Department of English at the annual meeting of the Modern Languages Association. First held at San Francisco in December 1987, the reception was an unqualified success. The Council was staggered by the large turnout of guests. In December 1988 the reception at the MLA in New Orleans produced again a very large turnout (about 150); many guests stayed late, and all food and beverages were consumed.

The jointly sponsored reception provides an excellent opportunity to continue recruiting candidates who have been interviewed. As opposed to the formal interview, the atmosphere is friendly and relaxed. Candidates are able to gain an appreciation for the CSU as a system and see the possibilities for collaboration with peers through an organization such as the English Council.

The cost of each reception was $1000. In 1987 the reception was funded by contributions from campus presidents. In 1988 it was funded by the CSU Foundation. Plans are underway to hold a third annual reception in December 1989. Similar joint functions could be sponsored by other disciplines within the CSU, although there would be no likelihood that they could rely on Foundation funds from the Chancellor's Office.

Discussion Groups on Cooperation

Several questions were asked about possibilities for inter-campus cooperation in recruiting. The following comments are the concensus from small group discussions on these questions.

1. **Re Advertising.** The Chronicle of Higher Education works for a narrow group of disciplines, is particularly effective for women candidates, and an ad for all tenure track positions on the campus is worthwhile. The suggestion of a systemwide ad led to a generally negative response. It would be instrumental in publicizing the CSU but not as a means to attract applicants.

Advertising in minority publications is good publicity for the campus affirmative action efforts, but networking and disciplinary minority caucuses are a better source of candidates.

2. **Re attendance at meetings representing the whole CSU.** It was agreed that neither Chancellor's staff nor other campuses could adequately represent a particular campus. The diversity of campuses and supposedly similar departments is so great that such cooperative efforts are not realistic.

3. **Sharing travel expenses** for bringing candidates to campus works, both within the CSU and with neighboring, private institutions.

4. **Strategies for hiring spouses** in dual career families are needed and could be a source of cooperation among campuses. If departments on two or more neighboring campuses developed agreements to consider the non-recruited spouse, such an agreement could be part of the initial advertising for a position.

How to Sell the Campus to the Candidate

Presenters: **Joan Schlaich**, Chair, Department of Dance, CSU, Long Beach
William Coffey, Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs, Office of the Chancellor

The campus visit is a critical element of the recruitment of faculty. It serves three major purposes:

1. To permit the department to evaluate the candidate.
2. To permit the candidate to evaluate the department, the campus and the surrounding community.
3. To provide the campus the opportunity to sell the campus to the candidate.

Greatest emphasis should be placed on the third purpose. Selling the campus is required by the increasing national competition for high quality faculty. Furthermore, good execution in the earlier part of the recruiting process should provide much information to both the campus and the candidate about one another. A campus visit is not for the purpose of eliminating candidates, and it should not be an ordeal for the visitor. Ideally, the campus visit should be a positive and supportive experience for all candidates, including those for whom it becomes obvious an offer will not be extended. The university's reputation is affected by the impression it makes on all visitors. Careful and broad-based preparation is required. The successful visit is well-staged, though it should not appear that way.

The Department of Dance at CSU, Long Beach has recently conducted several successful searches in the national market for outstanding faculty. The Department has given particular attention to the campus visit, because it presents many opportunities for snafus which might discourage a candidate. **Most problems of this nature can be attributed to a lack of civility, and the Department, in cooperation with the university administration, strives to apply the rules of courtesy as an operating principle.**

The following are some checklist items which have worked well for the Department of Dance:

1. Prepare the department faculty for their role. Have all full-time faculty review a candidate's resume prior to the visit.
2. Prepare the candidate in advance with attentive correspondence and attractive printed materials.
3. Invite candidates from cold climes when California weather makes a nice contrast.

4. The department chair should pick up (and return) the candidate at the airport if at all possible. If not the chair, someone else in a responsible position should handle this task.

5 Reserve a nice hotel or motel room for the candidate (not the dull hotel in the derelict part of town where the university has a special rate). Order fresh flowers and wine for the room.

6. Provide an opportunity for the candidate to meet with upper division students (without the faculty).

7. Arrange a private meeting with the dean (and brief the dean in advance). A meeting with the vice president or president is also very effective.

8. Allow the candidate to teach a class or give a presentation.

9. Give a guided tour of the salient features of the campus, but also allow the candidate some time for herself. Ask the candidate if she has any requests.

10. Have lunch with the candidate at a nice restaurant off campus. Show off the community. Choose restaurants or hotels with a view of the ocean or the mountains (only if they are in view that day, of course).

11. Give a buffet dinner at the home of a faculty member.

12. Reimburse the candidate before she or he leaves the campus.

13. Arrange to meet the candidate's spouse: offer to help in finding a job; provide information on local schools; have a realtor show the candidate and/or spouse affordable housing.

14. Quickly follow up the visit with a personal letter. Urge campus officials to expedite the process of making an offer. Have the president make the offer by telephone.

15. Evaluate the search and meet with chairs of other departments to discuss what worked and what didn't work.

Sample Campus Interview Schedule

Date: February 19, 1988

To: Dance Faculty

From: Joan Schlaich, Chair
Department of Dance

Subject: Interview - Ann XX, Monday and Tuesday, February 22-23.

SCHEDULE

Monday - Arrives at LAX about 11:00 (I'll pick her up).

Joan	1:00 - 2:00 - Watch some of Modern Dance Tech III - PE-107
Pat	Lunch when she wishes - on campus
Pat	2:00 - 3:40 - See campus and to Lib 302
All Faculty	4:00 - 5:20 - Lecture to Dance History in Library 302
Tryntje	Take to Buffet Dinner at Joan's at 6:00 (with all faculty)
Jeff	After dinner take back to Ramada

Tuesday - Pick up at motel around 8:30 - Joan

	8:45 - 9:30 - Meet with dance students
Joan	9:30 - 10:15 - Meet with Assistant Vice President
Joan	10:15 - 11:00 - Meet with Vice President
Joan	11:00 - 12:00 - Meet with department faculty
Becky	12:00 - 1:30 - Lunch off-campus and return (all faculty who are available)
Pat	1:45 - 2:30 - Watch some of Ballet Technique IV - TA-241
Jeff	3:00 - 4:00 - Watch some of Dance Workshop - TA-241
Joan	4:00 - Meet with School Dean
Tryntje	Dinner in Long Beach (all who are available)
Joan	To LAX - Plane leaves at 10:00 pm

Modern Horror Stories - Not to be Emulated

(True accounts of actual events from workshop participants)

1. Being interviewed in a hotel room. You are sitting on the bed, three interviewers occupy the only chairs, while:

    a. someone carries on a phone conversation;

    b. someone changes clothes/takes a shower/puts on makeup;

    c. you are asked questions about a university you never attended.

2. Finding your own way from the airport, arriving at the department office; the secretary says, "who?" and "sorry, they're all at lunch."

3. Having been picked up at the airport, you are dropped off at your hotel at 6 p.m. with no offer of a meal, nothing to do.

4. Having your interview day so tightly scheduled that you get no lunch.

5. Being told you'll be addressing students, but faculty attend and dominate the discussion.

6. Being told that you'll meet with the dean later in the afternoon. During your public lecture the dean leaves half way through. Later, at your meeting, the dean clearly hasn't read your resume.

7. Being driven back to the airport by a faculty member who:

    a. tells you what's wrong with the rest of the faculty;

    b. advises you not to take the job, if offered;

    c. makes you a job offer (unauthorized).

"You are trying to recruit a candidate's active interest in your post. Let that fact supersede any other." Ted Marchese, The Search Committee Handbook.

Socializing New Faculty

Presenters: **Anne Nordhus**, Assistant to the Provost, CSU, Chico
Judith Hunt, State University Dean, Faculty Affairs,
Office of the Chancellor

The recruitment of faculty is an expensive, time-consuming process, and in tomorrow's market its demands are likely to increase. CSU campuses have shown that they can attract high quality faculty from a national pool, though heroic efforts are sometimes required. However, the investment in recruiting and hiring will have been misspent if new faculty are not integrated fully into their new environment. The rapid socialization of new faculty helps to assure that the position just filled will not soon reopen.

CSU, Chico has recently instituted a new faculty orientation program which has been inspired by ideas inherent in freshman year programs. Through sustained and personal involvement in the life of the university, freshmen are more satisfied, they perform better, and they are more likely to complete their course of study. **Similarly, the new faculty orientation program seeks to involve new faculty in the life of the university in a year-long program on the assumption that their morale, performance and commitment will be strengthened.**

The new faculty orientation program is strongly backed by the school deans. It was supported in its first year by release time grants to participants. About thirty faculty, representing most of the schools and a wide range of previous professional experience, have participated. Topics included retention, tenure and promotion procedures, benefits, unions, computing facilities, library, admissions and records system, and so forth. Campus level orientation was not intended to replace the orientation of new faculty which was assumed to occur on the department level. The program began with a day-long workshop which featured instruction in "writing-across-the-disciplines," and it continued with periodic two-hour sessions on many different topics.

The program has been evaluated extensively. The reaction of participants has been gratifyingly positive. Some features of the program have stirred controversy in one quarter or another of the university community, and the experience of the first year will lead to changes in the second year.

What Worked:

1. Newcomers were made to feel very welcome, and they quickly developed a sense of loyalty to the academic community at Chico.

2. New faculty were introduced to campus-wide resources, use of which has enhanced their productivity.

3. The "writing-across-the-disciplines" workshop inspired several participants to introduce this technique into their regular classes.

What Didn't Work:

1. Release time for participation in the new faculty orientation program was a mistake. It resulted in overloads for other faculty in some departments, and it generated complaints from deans, department chairs and faculty union representatives. In the second year no release time will be linked to participation in new faculty orientation.

2. Attendance was poor at many sessions. In the future, attendance will be required of new faculty, who, in return, will be released from committee work.

3. Scheduling was difficult. Some workshops and meetings were repeated to accommodate different faculty schedules. There were too many meetings crowded into the first several weeks of the fall semester. Most sessions were too long. Next year there will be a two-day program during registration week, followed by short sessions during the course of the academic year. Efforts are being made to establish a university-wide orientation hour which can be incorporated into the schedules of all new faculty.

4. It was a false assumption that thorough orientation was being conducted by all departments. More information will be provided in the future about housing, schools, the academic schedule, book orders, health insurance, etc.

Some Other Changes Which Have Been Requested by Participants:

1. More sessions with second and third year faculty.

2. Assistance in instructional methods; "how to teach."

3. More "classroom stuff" - add/drop, grading.

4. A session with students.

5. More opportunities for socializing.

6. Presenters to explain why and when services, offices, specialists, would be used or needed; that is, why such things are useful and important to college teachers.

New Faculty Orientation Suggestions from Other CSU Campuses

- Provide a free local newspaper subscription for several weeks prior to their arrival in the community.
- Offer help or a meal when the moving van arrives.
- Revise campus MPPA criteria to include specific reference to mentoring new faculty.
- Have the President and/or Dean give a reception or party for all new faculty.

"I used to think that new faculty were an indifferent group. Now I realize that they were just bewildered." President Robin Wilson, CSU, Chico.

"Remember the three R's: <u>Recruitment</u> is only half of the job. <u>Reception</u> into a positive and supportive environment is essential to <u>Retention</u>." Arthurlene Towner, Dean, School of Education, CSU, Hayward.

Producing a Campus Handbook on Faculty Recruitment

Presenter: **Joyce Gattas**, Dean, College of Professional and Fine Arts, San Diego State University

If a campus does not compile and circulate a handbook or guide on faculty recruiting, it must trust that the hiring process is carried out properly and effectively by all departments. This assumes that departments:

1. Know best what kind of person is needed when a position is open.
   (In reality, departments tend to replace like with like.)

2. Will write a good job description.
   (Often departments overexpand the responsibilities.)

3. Know where to advertise most effectively.
   (The Chronicle is not necessarily the best placement; disciplinary journals are usually the best.)

4. Know how to set up and effect a search procedure.
   (A guide, with checklists, is very helpful.)

5. Know how to sell the campus to the candidates.
   (Again, they need a guide.)

6. Will correspond correctly and consistently with all candidates.
   (They need sample letters.)

7. Have followed scrupulously MOU and other legal requirements for conducting a search.
   (They need to know such things as how, when and where to keep notes in order to protect confidentiality.)

8. Will host effective campus visits for candidates.
   (Search committees can benefit from the knowledge of research on impression formation.)

9. Will screen finalists appropriately.
   (In reality, many committees change criteria in mid-search. They must learn to set the criteria early and not deviate).

San Diego State University has determined that the considerable wisdom required for making an effective search should not be assumed to exist in all departments. The growing challenge of faculty recruitment has required the publication of a source book on all elements of the search process.

In 1988 San Diego published its Guide for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty, which has been made available to every department. Handsomely bound in a red and white cover, the guide was printed for less than $2.00 per copy. Campus resources were used to develop and write the guide, but there there was

acknowledged borrowing from similar works from other campuses, including CSU, Long Beach and The Ohio State University. It is expected that the guide will be revised regularly to keep it up-to-date and to meet developing needs.

At least one copy of the SDSU guide was made available to every campus represented at the Faculty Recruitment Workshop. The scope of the guide is best indicated by the table of contents which is reproduced below:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Establishing the Search Committee	4
Department Chair and Search Committee's Responsibilities	5
Review of Advertisement	6
Recruitment	7
Confidentiality	8
Citizenship	8
Orientation to Campus	9
Travel Expenses	10
The Interview	11
Pre-Interview Planning	11
Guide to Pre-employment Inquiries	12
Interview Process	15
Applicable Laws and Policy	18
Appendix A (Sample Letters)	
Letter to Accompany Position Announcement	20
Application Acknowledgement Letters	21
Request for Complete Materials	22
Acknowledgement of Late Application	23
Rejection Letters	24
Appendix B (Summary of CSU Faculty Benefits)	26
Appendix C (Resources to help enlarge the pool of candidates)	28

OTHER SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR INCLUSION IN A HANDBOOK
(Contributed by Faculty Recruitment Workshop Participants)

1. How to establish criteria or characteristics for new faculty to be sought.
2. Proper protocol for a faculty search.
3. How to write an effective announcement.
4. How to target recruitment efforts.
5. A flow chart of the search process.
6. Timetable for the search process.
7. Responsibilities and roles of all persons involved in the search process.
8. How to develop a pool of candidates.
9. How to select and train a search committee.
10. Effective affirmative action techniques.
11. MOU and other legal requirements.
12. Questions that may not be asked of a candidate.

The Body of the Interview - Usually, it is a good practice to agree on a "core of questions" the committee will ask each candidate. Without some guiding core, committees fall into the trap of being so "spontaneous" (unplanned) that they ask a series of candidates vastly different questions. As a result, when interviews are concluded, there is often great difficulty in interpreting one's impressions or arriving at a meaningful comparison between candidates' responses.... from "The Interview Process," Guide for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty.

"The San Diego State University Guide for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty is based on the three C's of the search process: civility, consistency and common sense." Joyce Gattas, SDSU.

Conclusions

It was intended that workshop participants depart on April 26 with enthusiastic resolve to promote on-campus training for faculty engaged in recruitment and hiring. The Faculty Recruitment Workshop provided several models for training sessions, most of which could be adapted, improved and deployed successfully at home. Several anonymous comments on the evaluation forms pointed out that it is the faculty on hiring committees and department chairs who would most benefit from the workshop just presented.

For would-be workshop sponors, here are a few suggestions which were brought to our attention:

1. Develop clear materials and guidelines for use by departments. A campus recruitment handbook is strongly advised.

2. Workshops to train hiring committees should also include the Department staff.

3. Sensitivity to institutional affirmative action goals (for hiring minorities, the disabled and women in disciplines where they are underrepresented) should be incorporated into general recruitment training.

4. Experienced, successful faculty recruiters should be the main speakers at training sessions.

5. Department chairs should meet occasionally to discuss what worked and what didn't work during the current year's recruiting season.

Several recruiting issues and questions raised at the workshop generated disagreement among participants. These included:

1. The effectiveness of advertising in the Chronicle of Higher Education. Institutions and disciplines have had varying success with the Chronicle for tenure-track faculty positions.

2. Whether to hire at advanced ranks. While it may enable some departments to hire a quality candidate otherwise unavailable, it might also hurt the morale of tenure-track faculty already aboard.

3. How early is it necessary to authorize tenure-track positions? Opinions differed, but no one recommended authorizing a position later than the end of the previous academic year.

4. Who should socialize the new faculty? The alternatives expressed included:

   (a) Mentor faculty in the same department (advantage of same discipline and knowledge of a department's ways).

(b) Mentor faculty in another department (advantage of having a mentor who is independent of intra-departmental conflicts and separate from the evaluation process).

(c) Bring together new faculty, some administrators and selected older faculty, but not the senior faculty you are trying to improve on.

"Written materials related to the workshop should have been provided to participants in advance." Don Cameron, Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, CSU, Northridge.

"A lot was gained from the workshop. There was good, comprehensive coverage of the relatedness of issues (a womb to tomb approach)." Arthurlene Towner, CSU, Hayward.

The California State University
Faculty Recruitment Workshop
April 24-25, 1989

Selected References

Cecelia Dobrish, Hiring the Right Person for the Right Job (Franklin Watts, Inc., 1984).

Richard Fear, The Evaluation Interview (3rd. edition, McGraw-Hill, 1984).

Guide for Recruiting Faculty (San Diego State University, 1988).

Handbook for Faculty Searches (Office of Academic Affairs, The Ohio State University, 1987).

Richard Kaplowitz, Selecting College and University Personnel: The Quest and the Questions (ASHE - ERIC, 1986).

Theodore J. Marchese, The Search Committee Handbook: A Guide for Recruiting Administrators (AAHE, 1987).

Seeing and Evaluating People (Office of Women's Affairs, University of Delaware).